

6-3-03

ELX-5795L-6 (BXTD 9006.3)

PATENT

#7/16/06  
ELECT

1631

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Application of Jerry S. Powell

Art Unit 1631

JUN 05 2003

Serial No. 09/975,063

Filed October 10, 2001

Confirmation No. 2666

For METHOD OF MAKING GLYCOPROTEIN EXHIBITING ERYTHROPOIESIS  
REGULATING ACTIVITY AND GLYCOPROTEIN PRODUCED BY THIS  
METHOD

Examiner: James Martinell

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

June 2, 2003

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

TO THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS,

SIR:

This letter is in response to the Office action of May 2, 2003, in which an election as between the following groups of claims for prosecution on the merits was requested:  
Group I (claims 10-33) drawn to methods for expressing recombinant erythropoietin;  
Group II (claims 34-39) drawn to erythropoietin produced by the method of the Group I claims.

According to 35 U.S.C. §121, a restriction is proper only if there are at least two independent and distinct inventions. Furthermore, “[i]f the search and examination of an entire application can be made **without serious burden**, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.”<sup>1</sup>

In this case, restriction is not proper. The claims of Group I are directed toward a method of making recombinant erythropoietin and the claims of Group II are drawn to the recombinant erythropoietin produced by the method of the Group I claims. Because the Group I and Group II claims contain a common recited element, a method for

---

<sup>1</sup> MPEP § 803 (emphasis added).

producing recombinant erythropoietin, any search of the prior art and examination involving the Group I claims, therefore, will necessarily co-extend with the search and examination of the Group II claims. Moreover, the claims in this case are limited to the **Apa I restriction fragment** of the human erythropoietin gene, as opposed to the whole gene. The prior art regarding Apa I restriction fragments of the human erythropoietin gene is sufficiently sparse to allow the examination of these claims without undue burden. Since the examination of the entire application may be made without serious burden, the claims of Groups I and II should be examined together in accordance with MPEP § 803.

Applicant, subject to the foregoing traverse, hereby elects to prosecute the claims of Group I, claims 10-33, drawn to methods for expressing recombinant erythropoietin.

Applicant reserves the right to file divisional applications directed to the subject matter of the non-elected claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Kathryn J. Doty, Reg. No. 40,593  
SENNIGER, POWERS, LEAVITT & ROEDEL  
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
(314) 231-5400

KJD/dmt

Express Mail No.: EV 324379498 US  
Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment